DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 130 HE 003 297

TITLE	Upper-Level Institutions: A Report to the Texas Legislature.
INSTITUTION	Texas Coll. and Univ. System, Austin. Coordinating Board.
PUB DATE	Apr 72
NOTE	26p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Bachelors Degrees; *Degrees (Titles); *Higher Education; *Junior Colleges; Undergraduate Study; *Upper Division Colleges

ABSTRACT

One of the major demands arising out of the movement of the junior college is that of increased space for junior college graduates in baccalaureate awarding institutions. In the state of Texas the 4-year higher education institutions do not have the facilities to accommodate this increasing number of students. Thus, the state is faced with 2 alternatives: (1) increasing the number of 4-year colleges and universities; and (2) creating upper-level institutions that provide programs for the last 2 years toward a baccalaureate. After investigating the role and performance, advantages and disadvantages of upper-level institutions it is evident that the establishment of upper-level institutions promises to be the most economical way to meet the need to furnish additional baccalaureate degree opportunities to Texas students. (HS)

ED 066130

Upper-Level Institutions: A Report to the Texas Legislature

from the **Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 003 297

Upper-Level Institutions:
A Report to the Texas Legislature

Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System
State Finance Building, Austin, Texas
April, 1972

Preface

Senate Resolution 25, adopted June 4, 1971 during the First Called Session of the 62nd Texas Legislature, directed the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System to make a study of upper-level institutions and to report the results of that study to the 63rd Texas Legislature.

At the direction of the Coordinating Board, its staff undertook a comprehensive study of the role and performance, advantages and disadvantages of upper-level institutions. An estimate also was made of the savings which would result from implementing the seven upper-level institutions which had been authorized in Texas by the 61st and 62nd Legislatures.

Recognizing the impact on the Texas system of higher education of the creation of the new type institutions, the Coordinating Board in February, 1972 distributed a preliminary report among all Texas institutions of higher education with an invitation to submit criticisms and additional information as desired.

After careful review of the comments submitted, the Coordinating Board adopted on April 21, 1972 its report on upper-level institutions as presented in this publication. The Coordinating Board submits it to the 63rd Texas Legislature, Regular Session, in compliance with the directives contained in S.R. 25.

The information included in this report is presented with the hope that it will be of assistance to the legislative leaders of the State of Texas in their efforts to provide quality higher education for the men and women of this state.

Contents

Origins of the Upper-Level Institution 1

Status of Upper-Level Institution Development 2

Development of Upper-Level Institutions in Texas 7

Estimate of Savings Resulting from Creation of Upper-Level Institutions in Texas 9

Advantages of the Upper-Level Institution 12

Disadvantages of the Upper-Level Institution 13

Essential Ingredients of a Successful Upper-Level Institution 14

Conclusions 16

List of Upper-Division Institutions in the U.S. 18

Footnotes 20

Introduction

Based upon recommendations of the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, the 61st and 62nd Texas Legislatures authorized the creation of a total of seven new upper-level institutions in Texas in Odessa, Midland, Dallas, Corpus Christi, Houston, Laredo, Texarkana and Tyler.

In recommending the establishment of these new institutions, the Coordinating Board was concerned with expanding baccalaureate degree opportunities to Texas citizens at the lowest possible cost by not duplicating facilities and programs already available in junior colleges. The upper-level institutions will offer junior and senior level and sometimes graduate work, and are to be in direct support of area junior colleges.

The upper-level institution emphasizes teaching and encourages innovation in education methods and materials. It also offers programs designed to prepare students for direct entry into occupations rather than for research-oriented professions.

The development of these new institutions will exert considerable impact upon the Texas system of higher education. Educational leaders of the state, members of the Legislature, and the people of the State of Texas are dedicated to providing needed educational opportunities and services. However, they are also concerned that the educational dollar be spent in the most efficient way and that the structure of institutions make the best utilization of existing resources.

Senator Pete Snelson of Midland introduced and the Senate adopted a resolution during the 62nd legislative session calling on the Coordinating Board to study the performance and functions of upper-level institutions in other states, to analyze their strengths and weaknesses, and to assess their potential for meeting the needs and resources of Texas higher education.[1]

This paper presents background information on (1) the origins of upper-level institutions in the United States, (2) development of upper-level institutions in states other than Texas, (3) development of upper-level institutions in Texas, (4) an estimate of dollar savings that will result from establishment of upper-level institutions in Texas, (5) advantages and disadvantages of upper-level institutions, and (6) ingredients essential to the success of the new institution.

Origins of the Upper-Level Institution

The concept of upper-level institutions is not new, but the creation of these institutions as part of statewide systems of public higher education has occurred primarily since 1960.

The first upper-level institutions, established in the first half of the twentieth century, were predominantly privately supported and were responsive to the educational theory that the traditional four-year college could be bisected into "preparatory" and "university" segments.[2] The majority of these institutions still in existence are special purpose institutions, designed for a distinct type of student. For example, there are institutes for students desiring advanced work in art, languages, or accountancy and business administration.

By 1950 educational planners were considering the upper-level institution less in terms of educational theory and more as a practical way to (1) provide spaces and appropriate programs for burgeoning numbers of community college graduates, (2) meet needs of industry for qualified personnel, and (3) respond to growing political pressure for institutions to be established to serve the specific needs of geographically defined areas.

The success of the junior college movement and its resultant demands for more spaces in baccalaureate-degree granting institutions is the single most important factor in the development of upper-level institutions. The number of junior college students in the nation increased from about 750,000 in 1961 to just under 2 million in 1968. Community college enrollments in Texas have increased from about 62,000 in 1966 to more than 150,000 in 1971.

To meet the needs of these new students in higher education, educational planners and legislators could (1) convert existing junior colleges into four-year institutions, (2) create more four-year institutions, which would duplicate the programs available in the two-year colleges, or (3) create a new kind of educational institution.

Political considerations have probably played as strong a role in the establishment of upper-level institutions as have educational concerns.[3] Planners have resisted local pressures to convert two-year colleges for fear the change would result in their abandoning or neglecting their community service and vocational-technical programs. Local industries and politicians have pressed for creation of four-year institutions to serve specific area needs—often coupling these pressures with offers to make land and facilities available. Given local, legislative, and/or state agency opposition to converting the local junior college or to establish-

ing a competitive four-year institution, decision makers opted for the upper-level institution.

The rationale for the new upper-level institution is that it can (1) provide an educational experience tailored to the needs of the junior college transfer student and the student who changes institutions at the junior year, (2) encourage experimentation in educational methods and materials, (3) offer programs that relate specifically to the needs of the local area, (4) provide the depth of educational experience necessary for specialization in the junior and senior years of the baccalaureate program (5) provide an economically and educationally feasible alternative to the creation of four-year institutions in areas lacking in baccalaureate degree opportunities.

Status of Upper-Level Institution Development

In addition to Texas, eleven other states have established or have approved the establishment of upper-level institutions. Some ten additional states are considering the potential of the new institution to meet their state needs.

As of Fall 1971, there were 15 upper-level institutions in the United States which were fully accredited or recognized candidates for accreditation. Seven of those institutions were private and eight public. Eleven additional are in the planning or building and staffing stages, and all are public.[4] A list of upper-division colleges is attached to this report.

Most of the upper-level institutions now enrolling students are special purpose institutions. The public multi-purpose institution, designed to serve the needs of community college graduates, has been implemented so far in small numbers. It is significant to note that those institutions now in the planning stages are public and are of the multi-purpose type.

Enrollment is increasing in all but one of these upper-level institutions which were designed to serve a diverse student body. Florida Atlantic University, the University of West Florida, Richmond College in New York City, and Sangamon State University in Illinois all report enrollment increases. The Capitol Campus of Pennsylvania State University is the only similar type institution which reports a decrease in enrollment.[5]

While the motivations for and the patterns of development of upper-level institutions vary from state to state, there may be lessons to be learned from other's experiences with an experimental structure in higher education.

The states of Michigan and Florida were among the first to develop public upper-level institutions. Michigan has virtually abandoned the

concept of upper-level institutions, while the master plan adopted in 1964 by the State Board of Control of Florida recommends that all new senior institutions created in the future shall be upper-level universities.[6] The development of upper-level institutions in these two states offer a richness of contrast and a discussion of that development follows. However, before turning to the Michigan and Florida discussions, a brief look at developments in California and Massachusetts is worthwhile.

California

At this time, California has two private and one public upper-level institution. The public institution admits art students only. In the 1940's California established several upper-level institutions, with the intention of later adding the lower division years.

In the early 1960's the staff of the California Coordinating Council recommended the establishment of upper-level institutions, but the Council rejected the recommendation. The California Legislature then directed a legislative analyst to study the system of higher education. The analyst has now recommended that California's state senior colleges be changed to upper-level institutions. No action has been taken on the recommendation at this time.[7]

Massachusetts

The Board of Regional Community Colleges and the Board of State Colleges in Massachusetts announced this fall their joint decision to establish a new campus site which will contain both a comprehensive community college and an upper division branch of Boston State College. The upper division branch will serve graduates of the state's 13 community colleges. Its new curriculum will be a progression of the professional, career, and technical programs of the two-year colleges.[8]

Michigan

While two public upper-level institutions were established in Michigan, the state now has only one upper-level institution. It is a private college and serves students interested in accounting and business administration. Both the public upper-level institutions were established under the governing board of the University of Michigan. Two colleges, one at Dearborn and one at Flint, have now been converted to four-year institutions. In both cases, the primary reason cited for the conversion was inability to attract sufficient numbers of students. However, a study of the cases indicates that factors other than enrollment entered into the decision.

The Flint College Experience (1956–1965): Local leaders mounted a drive in the late 1940's for their community college to become a four-year institution. When legislators asked for studies, the University of Michigan regents entered into the planning in the early 1950's and recommended establishment of a branch campus in Flint. To preserve their junior college, Flint community leaders rejected the four-year idea and asked for an upper-level institution.[9]

The University of Michigan interest was prompted, in part, by the growing trend for state colleges to become universities and the resultant competition for a larger share of the state budget. University of Michigan planners wished to establish new centers of support by establishing branch campuses in urban areas.[10]

Reinforced by commitments from the Flint community (financed by philanthropists associated with Ford and General Motors) to provide money for new buildings, to share present junior college facilities, and to offer support in terms of students, the Michigan Legislature approved in 1955 the University of Michigan's request to establish an upper-level institution in Flint.[11]

The new institution opened in 1956 with 167 students, and enrollment had reached 525 by 1962—considerably less than the number anticipated.[12]

By the early 1960's, support was mounting to convert the upper-level institution to a four-year institution. Flint community representatives were concerned because other communities in the state were obtaining four-year colleges and universities, and they might be outspaced. There was also some pressure for the community college to strengthen and expand its vocational-technical offerings and de-emphasize its liberal arts orientation.[13]

When the Mott Foundation announced its offer of $2.4 million for construction of the facilities required for the expanded program, it was only a matter of time until approval was forthcoming, and the university opened its expanded institution in September, 1965.[14]

Despite disappointment in enrollment, the University of Michigan regents said that the "success (of upper-level institution) has been gratifying."[15] The dean of the college observed that the institution was a "historical accident."[16] The university was not committed to Flint College as an educational or experimental unit. It had developed because circumstances and community pressure so dictated, and when circumstances and community desires changed, Flint College changed also.

The Dearborn Campus Experience (1959–Summer 1971): The upper-level institution at Dearborn was created between August, 1955, and November, 1956, as a direct result of negotiations initiated by the Ford Motor Company with the University of Michigan.[17]

With the offer to supply land and $6.5 million building money, Ford asked the University of Michigan to obtain operating funds to provide programs which would meet Ford's manpower requirements in engineering and business. According to Robert Altman, the purpose was to recruit community college graduates into the production area and then to furnish them opportunities to acquire engineering or management credentials.[18] He added, "past experience had shown engineering graduates reluctant to enter manufacturing engineering (as opposed to product engineering), and business graduates were loath to enter plant management."[19]

The University was responsive to the offer but specified that the Dearborn Center also would offer baccalaureate-level liberal arts programs. Plans called for enrollment of 2,500 students—1,000 in undergraduate liberal arts, 1,000 undergraduate and 500 graduate students in engineering and business, of whom approximately 60 percent would be assigned to Ford Motor Company to work off campus.[20]

However, college administrators set the same selective admission standards which were used for the Ann Arbor campus of the University of Michigan.[21] The result was severe limitation of the new institution's potential to draw on community college graduates and the necessity to compete for its students with the nearby Ann Arbor campus.

Dearborn opened in 1959 with an enrollment of 34 students and reached a maximum enrollment of 822 in Fall 1969.[22] A committee recommended that the University add lower division programming in Fall 1970. The same committee also recommended "flexible admission standards to allow it to serve a more diverse group of high school students."[23] In other words, the change in structure without the change in admission standards was not considered sufficient to result in a significant increase in enrollment.

Florida

Two public upper-level institutions are now in operation in Florida, with two others scheduled to open in Fall 1972. In fact, Florida's present plan for higher education development recommends that freshman and sophomore programs not be a part of any baccalaureate degree-granting institution developed in Florida after 1964.[24] All new institutions are planned as urban, upper-level universities drawing upon local community colleges and heavily populated areas.

The decision to develop upper-level institutions rather than four-year senior institutions stems from desire not to duplicate lower-division work now offered in Florida's many public junior colleges, not to increase vastly the size of existing public four-year institutions, and not to change the structure of the state's public community colleges.[25]

The initial recommendation for a system which accommodated growth through community colleges and upper-level institutions was contained in the report of the Brumbaugh Commission in the mid-1950's.[26] These conclusions were modified through additional studies, recommendations of the state planning agency, considerations of the Legislature, and pressures from local groups.

The first of the upper-level institutions to be authorized and to open was Florida Atlantic University at Boca Raton. The new institution was off to an unsteady start when it opened its doors to 867 students in 1964. Its problems were associated with site, planning, finances, programs, and student supply.

The gift of an abandoned airfield at Boca Raton determined the location of the new institution, even though it is situated some 40 miles from the metropolitan Miami area it is designed to serve.[27] It is approximately one hour commuting time removed from Miami-Dade Junior College and about one-half hour commuting time from three other area community colleges.[28] No dormitories were planned to accommodate students who found the commuting a barrier.

Dr. Herbert Stallworth, assistant to the president at Florida Atlantic University and an active participant in planning efforts for the institution, has indicated that plans for Florida Atlantic University were more idealistic than practical. With receipt of a grant from the Ford Foundation, the plans were to create a "University of the 21st Century," which would utilize all the technological advances available to education. Not only did the Legislature not appropriate funds to operate the ambitious program, but the administrators and faculty came to realize that most of their students—many of whom were economically disadvantaged, minority students—did not relate to the programs and teaching techniques which they were offered.[29]

With dedication to the concept of the upper-level institution, the administrators have been able to overcome many of the early problems. They have (1) built dormitories to accommodate students, (2) actively sought the assistance of feeder junior colleges in planning new programs, (3) initiated a scholars program whereby talented high school graduates enter directly into upper division work, and (4) have consciously attempted to relate offerings to needs of area junior college graduates. The institution offers programs in education, business and public administration, humanities, English, science, and social science. It has awarded more than 7,000 degrees since 1964.[30]

Its pattern of growth over the past few years has been healthy. Its enrollment grew from 5,249 in 1970 to 5,764 in 1971—a 9.4 percent increase.[31] Even so, enrollment has not reached the level projected in early planning, which called for 10,000 students by 1970. Robert Altman comments that the projections may have been overly optimistic, since the

present enrollment is approximately equal to the number in the upper divisions at Florida State University or the University of Florida.[32]

Even before Florida Atlantic University opened, the decision was made to establish a second upper-level institution in the Pensacola area. Overriding state agency recommendations that the new institution not be established before 1970, the Florida Legislature in 1963 appropriated $2.1 million to establish West Florida University in Pensacola by September, 1967.[33] When the new institution opened on that date, it had 1,318 students enrolled, the largest first-year class of any of the existing upper division institutions. It has continued its growth, jumping to 2,500 students the second year, reaching an enrollment of 3,300 in Fall 1971.[34]

The University of West Florida draws its students from three feeder colleges, situated within a radius of 100 miles from Pensacola, and 82 percent of its students are community college graduates. There are approximately 12,000 students enrolled in the three feeder colleges, with 6,000 of them in college transfer programs.[35] As a point of comparison, there are 5,500 students in four feeder colleges located within 100 miles of The University of Texas of the Permian Basin who are enrolled in semester-length courses.[36] The four feeder community colleges are Western Texas College in Snyder, Midland College, Odessa College, and Howard County Junior College in Big Spring.

Development of Upper-Level Institutions in Texas

The Texas Legislature has approved the creation of seven upper-level institutions in Texas, all of which were recommended by the Coordinating Board. The University of Texas at Dallas and The University of Texas of the Permian Basin, were authorized by the Legislature in 1969.

A third upper-level institution, Texas A&I University's Laredo Center stemmed from cooperative arrangements between A&I and Laredo Junior College. The 62nd Legislature has approved the establishment of four additional upper-level institutions—Texas A&I at Corpus Christi, Tyler State College, University of Houston at Clear Lake, and an upper-level branch of East Texas State University at Texarkana.

Based on 1970 census figures and other statistical data, upper-level institutions may need to be established to meet future needs in other localities.

The upper-level institutions approved for Texas are designed to be in direct support of junior colleges and to provide educational experiences uniquely tailored to the needs of the junior college transfer student as well as to other students who choose to change institutions after

completion of their sophomore year. In those areas in which public junior colleges provide convenient access to higher education for large numbers of students but in which baccalaureate education is not readily available, upper-level institutions provide an economically and educationally feasible alternative to the creation of four-year institutions which would duplicate the offerings of existing junior colleges.

When the Coordinating Board recommended in 1968 the creation of upper-level institutions in Odessa, Dallas, Corpus Christi, and Houston, those recommendations included the following statements:

Midland-Odessa:

"... the public junior colleges in Odessa and Big Spring be expected to enlarge their college transfer classes in direct support of the new upper-level senior institution...."[37]

Dallas:

"... The college is to be in direct support of the Dallas and Tarrant County Junior College System...."[38]

Corpus Christi:

"... Del Mar and Bee County Junior College be expected to enlarge their college transfer classes in direct support of the new upper-level institutions...."[39]

Houston:

"... a (new) campus ... in direct support of Houston area junior colleges...."[40]

It is clear the Coordinating Board was recommending the creation of a new type of higher educational facility that would complement and take advantage of the excellent public community junior college facilities and programs that already existed, including the potential continued growth of these institutions.

Only two of the new upper-level institutions are presently enrolling students—The University of Texas at Dallas and the Laredo Center of Texas A&I University.

The University of Texas at Dallas is accepting only master's and doctoral candidates, and degrees are granted through UT-Austin. In Fall 1970, there were 45 students enrolled. In Fall 1971 enrollment was 70. Development plans call for the admission of junior and senior students in Fall 1975.

The University of Texas of the Permian Basin, surrounded with controversy both on what type institution it should be and the site on which it should be located, recently dedicated its first campus building. It is scheduled to enroll students by Fall 1973.

Texas A&I University Center at Laredo first accepted students in Fall 1970, and its success is remarkable. Laredo Junior College needed to

make fuller use of excellent space it had available. Because of its isolated geographic location, the community also needed to make baccalaureate degree opportunities available locally. The Laredo Center presently is authorized to offer only programs leading to the baccalaureate degree. In Fall 1970, a total of 286 students enrolled. Enrollment jumped to a total of 456 students in Fall 1971—an increase of 59 percent.[41]

The promise and success of the Laredo Center have influenced other universities to pattern their efforts to offer baccalaureate and master's degree opportunities in similar ways. East Texas State University received funds from the 62nd Legislature ($125,000 for Fiscal 1972) to create an upper-division, off-campus center at Texarkana. ETSU proposes cooperative arrangements with Texarkana College in regard to use of its existing facilities.

Texas A&I University at Corpus Christi was funded by the 62nd Legislature for $125,000 in 1972 and is in the developmental stage.

The 62nd Legislature also created an upper-level institution at Tyler under its separate board of regents. Although no funding was provided for its operation, it is anticipated that appropriations will be made for its use either by the next special or regular session of the Legislature.

Also, the establishment of the University of Houston at Clear Lake was authorized, but no funds were appropriated by the 62nd Legislature.

Estimate of Savings Resulting From Creation of Upper-Level Institutions in Texas

The establishment of upper-level institutions rather than institutions which offer the traditional four years of undergraduate instruction should result in savings to the State of Texas in (1) investment in physical plants, (2) reduced maintenance and operating costs, and (3) avoiding duplication of costs for faculty, library, and teaching supplies and equipment associated with offering freshman and sophomore level work.

The State of Texas would realize immediate and tangible savings in the amount of money required to build physical plants for upper-level institutions rather than for four-year institutions. Savings in current operating costs also will occur annually because of lower maintenance and operating costs.

There is a direct relationship between reduced amounts required for investment in physical plant and for maintaining those facilities. The savings which would accrue in these two areas are easily estimated and are presented in this study.

Other savings are just as certain and just as real, but are more difficult to measure because their magnitude depends on the aggressiveness

of local planning efforts. It is obvious that savings will result from not duplicating faculty, library, and teaching supplies and equipment for the first two years of college work. At the same time, it is obvious that duplication and overlapping of expenditures will occur when two separate institutions are in competition to deliver the same educational service to the same students. When junior colleges and four-year senior institutions operate in the same geographical area such competition will occur and will result in duplication of expenditures. However, it is very difficult to estimate the dollar amount of such duplicate costs and no effort is made here to estimate the cost of that duplication which would become a saving to the state when the duplication is avoided.

Although it is not possible to put a dollar figure on the savings that will accrue from not duplicating programs, it is possible to estimate the savings which will result from not duplicating physical plant investments. The estimate of savings of funds invested in physical plant for upper-level institutions in this study is based on the facilities which would have been required to provide baccalaureate degree opportunities had free-standing, four-year undergraduate plus graduate level institutions been established.

Before citing the estimated dollar savings, it is interesting to look at the "center concept" as a means of utilization of existing facilities to expand college opportunities. Educational planners in the Laredo area realized that there was need to offer area students opportunities to obtain baccalaureate degrees locally. They also realized, however, that the magnitude of the demand for such degrees did not justify the expenses of a free-standing upper-level university. Thus, the "center concept" was recommended and the Laredo Center of Texas A&I University was established.

Laredo Junior College is now experiencing fuller utilization of available space. By leasing space to the upper-level center, the junior college also is receiving much needed income to meet debt service requirements on outstanding bonds. In this case, no new investment in physical plant was required to start the upper-level center. To have duplicated existing space for freshman and sophomore students would have been a financial mistake.

The following compilation of savings that will result from implementation of upper-level rather than four-year institutions considers both the immediate savings that result from not duplicating facilities for freshman and sophomore students and also the annual savings which will be realized in lower maintenance and operating costs for the reduced investment in physical plants.

The figures are based only on savings which will result from the establishment of the seven institutions already approved by the Texas Legislature.[42] If additional upper-level institutions are needed, the State of Texas would realize even greater savings than shown in Table I.

Table I

Location	Projected Enrollment 1980*	Theoretical Fresh. & Soph. Enrollment	Immediate Savings†	Annual Savings in Maintenance and Operating Cost‡
Midland-Odessa	4,800	5,900	$ 22,050,000	$ 595,000
Dallas	8,300	10,200	37,907,000	1,023,000
Corpus Christi	5,000	6,100	22,854,000	617,000
Tyler	4,100	5,000	18,710,000	505,000
Houston	4,800	5,900	22,568,000	609,000
Laredo	1,300	1,600	12,085,000	326,000
Texarkana	1,900	2,400	17,350,000	468,000
Totals	30,200	37,100	$153,524,000	$4,143,000

* Includes only junior, senior, and graduate students.
† Would result from not duplicating facilities for freshman and sophomore students.
‡ Annual savings in maintenance and operating cost would result from reduced investment in physical plant.

Advantages of the Upper-Level Institution

A study of the development of upper-level institutions indicates that the upper-division and graduate structure has some distinct advantages to recommend it.

1. *Where large numbers of junior college students are in an area which has limited baccalaureate degree opportunities, the upper-level institution provides an economically and educationally feasible alternative to the creation of four-year institutions which duplicate both facilities and programs of existing junior colleges.*

The Coordinating Board estimate of cost savings which would accrue from not duplicating existing facilities and from reduction in maintenance and operating costs of facilities shows the magnitude of savings which accrue in physical plant investment and maintenance.

Although difficult to measure, savings would certainly result from not duplicating program offerings and their accompanying costs of faculty, library, and teaching supplies and equipment. The experiences of upper-level institutions operating in Florida indicate that these savings are not distorted by increased costs for the upper-level institution.

Both Dr. Stallworth of Florida Atlantic University and Dr. H. B. Crosby, president of the University of West Florida, indicate that it *costs no more* to operate an upper-level institution. They are operating their institutions on the same formula level as programs and functions in other universities in the state system. Both indicate, however, that in some measure, costs are a function of size.[43] For example, overhead costs for an institution enrolling 3,500 students might be somewhat higher than for an institution enrolling 13,500 students.

2. *The new institution also can be responsive to identified weaknesses in the traditional system of higher education.*

Numerous prestigious study groups have been critical of the growing "homogenization" of higher education. A national task force, headed by Frank Newman, observed that while the population seeking higher education is becoming even more diverse—in class and social background, age, academic experience, and ability—colleges and universities continue to stress only the traditional academic mode of teaching and learning.[44]

Two of the recommendations included in the Newman Report are (1) that students be given more opportunities to learn through practical experiences and (2) that more practitioners be used in classroom situations.[45]

Since traditional four-year institutions have demonstrated reluctance or inability to meet the needs of the expanding vocational-technical students in the community colleges, a new type of baccalaureate institution could fill a very real gap in the higher education system by

providing programs and learning experiences which these students and older students returning to college are seeking.

3. *The upper-level institution concept is responsive to implementation of curricular reforms suggested by recent study groups.*

The recommendations include (1) shortening the time required to acquire baccalaureate and graduate degrees[46] and (2) providing more entry and exit points in higher education by requiring the associate degree enroute to the baccalaureate and the master's degree enroute to the doctorate.[47]

In his study, *Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches*, Dr. Stephen Spurr urged adoption of the policy of admitting high school graduates for the associate program only and requiring readmission for the bachelor's program. He cited as one of the advantages of such a plan that two-year college transfers would have an "equal opportunity to compete with those in the lower division already on campus."[48] Dr. Spurr also said that such a plan would have the further advantage of enabling each institution to program the number of upper division students separately from those in the lower division.[49] Even though Dr. Spurr enthusiastically endorses the concept of requiring the associate degree as a prerequisite to the next degree, he does not advocate confining general liberal arts education to the first two years and states his belief that "there continues to be merit in providing integrated four-year undergraduate programs on a university campus rather than farming out the first two years to a junior college system."[50]

4. *The new upper-level institutions can be planned to meet new needs for specific concentrations in baccalaureate education.*

The new institutions appear to be one vehicle for offering the newly-developing, professionally oriented baccalaureate degrees, such as the Bachelor of Technology or its equivalent. By expanding offerings in non-liberal arts areas, the status and desirability of present "career" or "terminal" junior college programs could be increased, in turn increasing enrollments in these programs during the first two collegiate years.

Disadvantages of the Upper-Level Institution

There have been certain problems associated with the establishment of the new type of higher education institution. The recurring ones discussed are the following:

1. *Inability of upper-level institutions to attract a sufficient number of students.*

A constant and direct flow of students from the sophomore year (community college graduate or transfer student from another four-year

institution) cannot be assumed. If community college graduates have the financial means to continue their education and live away from home, they are often attracted by the glamor of the larger university which offers a variety of traditional extra-curricular activities and, particularly, a football team.

There is a critical need to establish close liaison with feeder community colleges and to base programs on needs of those students. Upper-level institutions which are experiencing enrollment growth are heavily oriented toward teaching and business programs, possibly indicating that students selecting upper-division colleges desire major fields which lead to immediate employment as opposed to those which lead to continued study at a graduate institution.

2. *Inability to offer courses needed by students who have certain deficiencies and students who wish to change fields of study.*

While proponents of the upper-level institution agree that the institution must provide the elasticity to accommodate changes of program, they do not consider it a major problem. Dr. Crosby, president of the University of West Florida and of the Association of Upper-Level Colleges and Universities, indicates that the situation is best met by a cooperative relationship with feeder junior colleges so that (1) the student can travel to the community college for the desired course, (2) an instructor from the community college can conduct a special class at the upper-level institution, or (3) an instructor from the upper-level institution can participate in a faculty exchange program and teach the needed course on the junior college campus.[51]

Essential Ingredients of a Successful Upper-Level Institution

The experiences of the pioneering upper-level institutions have been diverse, and one cannot presume to say that a formula for success is readily apparent or even available. However, it is possible to identify common factors in successful operations and equally important, to identify certain pitfalls.

1. *Realistic assessments of the potential enrollment for a new upper-level institution.*

The upper-level institution is in open competition for students with all other public and private institutions in its region, and the percentage of junior college graduates who will elect to attend the new institution should be carefully estimated. Overly optimistic projections have contributed to problems at most new upper-level institutions, particularly at Dearborn and Flint in Michigan and at Florida Atlantic University.

2. *Early and continuing involvement of community college leaders in planning for an upper-level institution.*

A close and continuing liaison with feeder junior colleges is essential to the successful implementation of an upper-level institution. There must be a conscientious effort to serve community college graduates' needs and to develop programs suited to those needs—both in short-term and long-term benefits.

3. *Development of excellence in counseling and recruitment programs.*

Graduates of community colleges have already undergone sifting and sorting and upper-level colleges can use more counseling time to develop individual programs. Efforts should be made to provide an educational program uniquely suited to the individual's needs. Satisfying and rewarding educational opportunities for the junior college graduates who have attended the new institution will determine the success of later recruiting efforts.

4. *Careful development of admission requirements and of a policy on transfer between the junior colleges and the new institution.*

Just as the high school diploma marks the successful completion of a secondary school education, there is a growing trend for the associate degree to mark the successful completion of the next stage of academic progress. In any event, the admission policies of the new upper-level institution should be developed in close cooperation with the feeder institutions. The entering student must know on what basis he is accepted and what is required to earn a baccalaureate degree.

5. *Careful selection of sites.*

To insure an adequate flow of students through an institution in two to three years, as opposed to four to five years in traditional senior institutions, upper-level colleges generally should be located near large centers of population. If the proposed institution is to serve a relatively broad geographic area, it will be necessary to plan for adequate dormitory facilities to accommodate those who live too far away to commute.

6. *Matching curricular offerings to the needs and interests of the students.*

The new upper-level institutions *must* offer students opportunities they cannot find elsewhere. The program offerings must respond to growing needs for professional and vocational baccalaureate degrees. Teaching methods and techniques must be designed to fit the new programs. One such path to failure seems to be to try to build a carbon copy of the programs available in traditional four-year colleges.

7. *Planning carefully so that proper utilization is made of faculty members.*

Altman recommends that new institutions explore the possibilities of faculty exchange programs which allow upper division faculty to teach at other institutions—primarily local junior colleges. Such an arrange-

ment, he feels, increases faculty utilization and acts as a drawing card to attract students. He also feels addition of graduate programs, as needed, strengthens the new institution.[52]

8. *Assuring the commitment of the board of regents, the administration, the faculty, and the community.*

Perhaps this is the most important factor in the success of new upper-level institutions. As Altman has observed, "An institution established in an experimental form—with all the concomitant problems associated with it . . . must have firmer support and reason for its being than the refusal of a state agency to allow conversion, the sudden availability of a plot of land, or the desire of a legislative delegation to secure an institution for its constituents."[53]

The experiences of both upper-level institutions which have later changed to four-year institutions and of institutions which have overcome early difficulties suggest that unless an institution is committed to the concept of an upper-level institution, that there will be a tendency to reject the form of organization when difficulties arise rather than to look beyond that rejection to the basic cause of its difficulties.

Conclusions

The success of the junior college movement and its resultant demands for more spaces in baccalaureate degree-granting institutions is the single most important factor in the development of upper-level institutions.

But given the need to furnish more baccalaureate degree opportunities, the question still remains as to whether the establishment of upper-level institutions is the best way to meet that need. Is the concept of upper-level institutions educationally sound? Is their establishment economically desirable? What is their potential for meeting the needs and resources of Texas higher education?

The indications are that the educational concept of upper-level institutions is sound. However, the history of the development of the new type institution carries the message that the upper-level institution cannot thrive unless its leaders are committed to its purposes and special permission.

An analysis of the history of the development of upper-level institutions indicates that the experimental, new kind of institution has experienced operational difficulties. That analysis also indicates that the problems can be anticipated and overcome by careful planning and a willingness to change and adapt to the needs of the potential student consumers of the institutions' wares.

It is also true that the upper-level concept is not broadly understood. As Dr. Harold Crosby of the University of West Florida states it, "some missionary work must be done to overcome that knowledge gap."[54]

After his complete and comprehensive review of the development of each of the new upper-level institutions in the country—their successes and their failures—Robert Altman concluded in 1970, "junior colleges are the fastest growing segment of American higher education; there is every indication that public upper-division institutions will be developed apace . . . Existing upper-division institutions have demonstrated that this institution is workable, despite operational problems."[55]

There is need for more baccalaureate degree-granting institutions in Texas to meet the needs of junior college transfer students.

The growing junior college movement in Texas, the increased numbers and types of students entering Texas community colleges, the broadening programs in vocational-technical education, and the paucity of baccalaureate programs designed specifically to meet the needs of the student who wants to enter the work force as quickly as possible or the adult who wishes to refresh his education for a new vocation, support the need for a new type of institution in Texas higher education.

The establishment of upper-level institutions promises to be the most economical way to meet the need to furnish additional baccalaureate degree opportunities to Texas students.

A compilation of savings that will result from implementation of the seven upper-level institutions now authorized by the Texas Legislature rather than four-year institutions shows that the State of Texas would realize immediate savings of more than $153 million in facilities costs alone. Savings in maintenance and operating costs for the seven new institutions is estimated to be more than $4 million each year.

The estimated savings do not take into account further economies which would result from not duplicating programs now offered by junior colleges.

Upper-level institutions show great potential for meeting the needs and resources of Texas higher education.

The upper-level institution has great potential for bringing needed change and flexibility to the Texas system of higher education. The new type institution offers opportunities for implementing programs responsive to the needs of community college graduates and to the needs of industry. Upper-level institutions could help alleviate the problem of overcrowded state colleges and universities. They offer a viable alternative to traditionalism.

UPPER DIVISION INSTITUTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AS OF NOVEMBER, 1971

Institution	Charter Date	Location	Control	Type	Highest Degree Offered	Fall 1969 Headcount Enrollment	Fall 1971 Preliminary Headcount Enrollment
California							
Otis Art Institute	1918	Los Angeles	Public	Art only	Master's	444	383
Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies	n/a	Monterey	Private	Languages	n/a	n/a	346
Pacific Oaks College	1957	Pasadena	Private	L.A. & T.Ed.	Master's	363	255
Florida							
Florida Atlantic University	1964	Boca Raton	Public	L.A. & T.Ed.	Doctoral	5,249(1970)	5,764
University of West Florida	1967	Pensacola	Public	L.A.-Gen'l	Master's	2,910	3,348
Florida International[1]		Miami	Public	L.A.-Gen'l			
University of North Florida[1]		Jacksonville	Public	L.A.-Gen'l			
Illinois							
Governor's State University	1971	Park Forest	Public	L.A.			695
Sangamon State University	1970	Springfield	Public	L.A.-Gen'l	Master's		1,569
Indiana							
Concordia Senior College (men only)	1957	Fort Wayne	Private	L.A.	Baccalaureate	414	431
Massachusetts							
Boston Center, Boston State College[3]	1971	Boston	Public		Baccalaureate		
Minnesota							
Minnesota Metropolitan State College Center[2]		St. Paul	Public				
Michigan							
Walsh College of Accountancy and Business Administration	n/a	Troy	Private	Acct. & Bus. Adm.	n/a		350

New York							
CUNY, Richmond College	1967	Staten Island	Public	Gen'l	Master's	2,299	3,134
School of Applied Science at Rochester Institute of Technology	n/a	Rochester	Private		n/a		177
SUNY, Upper Division College	n/a	Utica	Public		n/a		
Ohio							
Garfield Senior College	n/a	Painesville	Private		n/a		365
Pennsylvania							
Penn. State Univ., Capitol Campus	1966	Middletown	Public	L.A. & T.Ed.	Master's	1,634	1,457
Tennessee							
Scarritt College	1924	Nashville	Private			n/a	n/a
Texas							
Texas A&I Center at Laredo	1970	Laredo	Public		Baccalaureate	286(1970)	456
Texas A&I at Corpus Christi[3]		Corpus Christi	Public				
UT Dallas	1969	Dallas	Public	Gen'l	Doctoral	45(1970)	70
UT Permian Basin[2]	1969	Odessa	Public	Gen'l			
Univ. of Houston at Clear Lake[3]	1971	Houston	Public				
East Texas State Univ. Branch[3]	1971	Texarkana	Public				
Tyler State College[3]	1971	Tyler	Public				

[1] To open Fall 1972.
[2] To open Fall 1973.
[3] In planning stages.

Footnotes

1. S.R. 25, introduced by Sen. Pete Snelson of Midland, adopted by the Texas Senate on June 4, 1971.
2. A discussion of the philosophies for dividing the first and the latter two years of college work are included in Robert A. Altman, *The Upper Division College*, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970), pp. 21–45, 159–160.
3. Discussions of the development of upper-level institutions in Florida, Michigan, New York and Pennsylvania support this conclusion. Altman, *The Upper Division College*, pp. 83–156, passim.
4. Unpublished data supplied by the Association of Upper Level Colleges and Universities.
5. Enrollment figures supplied to Coordinating Board by individual institutions.
6. The recommendation that no more freshman and sophomore years would be part of any public senior institution developed in Florida after 1964, was included in the master plan for development of higher education adopted by the Florida Board of Control in 1964.
7. Data presented by Robert Altman on Nov. 12, 1971 in Corpus Christi, Texas, at meeting of the Association of Upper Level Colleges and Universities.
8. American Association of State Colleges and Universities *Memo*, Vol. II, No. 17, Nov. 15, 1971.
9. Details of negotiations which preceded the establishment of Flint College are discussed by Robert Altman, *The Upper Division College*, pp. 83–90.
10. *Op. cit.*, pp. 89–90, 124.
11. *Op. cit.*, p. 91.
12. *Op. cit.*, p. 120.
13. *Op. cit.*, pp. 120–122.
14. *Op. cit.*, pp. 126–127.
15. *Op. cit.*, p. 125.
16. *Op. cit.*, p. 128.
17. *Op. cit.*, pp. 98, 163.
18. *Op. cit.*, pp. 98–101.
19. *Op. cit.*, p. 99.
20. *Op. cit.*, p. 101.
21. *Op. cit.*, pp. 163–164.
22. *Op. cit.*, p. 163.
23. *Op. cit.*, p. 163.
24. *Op cit.*, pp. 110–111.
25. Robert A. Altman, *A Study of the Establishment of Upper Division Colleges in the United States*, (Washington Ed.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1969), pp. 40–41.
26. *Op. cit.*, pp. 35–36.
27. Altman, *The Upper Division College*, pp. 95–96.
28. Interview with Dr. Herbert Stallworth, assistant to the president, Florida Atlantic University, Nov. 17, 1971.
29. *Loc. cit.*
30. These actions were described by Dr. Stallworth. In addition, details of the Faculty Scholars program, which has allowed almost 200 talented high school students to save a year of baccalaureate work, are included in an article by Robert F. Stetson, "Getting a Head Start on College," *College Board Review*, No. 81, Fall 1971, pp. 23–25.

31. Enrollment figures supplied to the Coordinating Board by Florida Atlantic University officials.
32. Altman, *The Upper Division College*, p. 168.
33. *Op. cit.*, pp. 118–119.
34. Enrollment figures supplied to the Coordinating Board by West Florida University officials.
35. Southern Regional Education Board, "Cluster and Upper Division Colleges," *Issues in Higher Education*, Nov. 2, 1971, p. 6, and interview with Dr. Harold Crosby, president of West Florida University, Nov. 17, 1971.
36. Enrollment data on file at Coordinating Board offices.
37. Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, Policy Paper 4: *Public Senior College Development to 1980*, (Austin: Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1968), p. 7.
38. *Op. cit.*, p. 10.
39. *Op. cit.*, p. 8.
40. *Op. cit.*, p. 8.
41. Enrollment data on file in Coordinating Board offices.
42. Figures are computed from data presented in Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System's Policy Paper 4: *Public Senior College Development in Texas to 1980.*
43. Interviews with Dr. Stallworth and Dr. Crosby, Nov. 17, 1971.
44. Frank Newman, ed., *Report on Higher Enucation*, (U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1971), p. 17.
45. *Op. cit.*, pp. 67–77.
46. This idea is discussed in some detail in a study by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Less Time, More Options*, (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1971).
47. The alternative approaches to achieve this goal are included in a study done for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education by Dr. Stephen H. Spurr, *Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches*, (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1970).
48. *Op. cit.*, p. 47.
49. *Loc. cit.*
50. *Op. cit.*, p. 27.
51. Interview with Dr. Crosby, Nov. 17, 1971.
52. Altman, *The Upper Division College*, pp. 169–170.
53. Altman, *A Study of the Establishment of Upper Division Colleges*, p. 55.
54. Interview with Dr. Crosby, Nov. 17, 1971.
55. Altman, *The Upper Division College*, pp. 170–175.